

**Remarks/Arguments:**

1. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 are pending. Claim 1 is currently being amended herein to reflect that the genome of the genetically-modified mouse comprises a homozygous disruption of the RAMP1 gene. As the Examiner will appreciate, support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 6, lines 24-26. Claim 6 is currently being amended herein to recite a mouse cell isolated from the mouse of claim 1. Claim 7 is currently being cancelled in favor of new claim 15 currently being added herein. Support for new claim 15 is found in the original claim 7, and elsewhere in the specification as originally filed, for example, from page 22, line 26, to page 25, line 14. As the Examiner will appreciate, no new matter is added by any of the above amendments.

2. Claims 1, 3, and 6 stand rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. According to the Examiner, “[t]he breadth of claim 1 is such that it encompasses both a transgenic mouse wherein all somatic and germ cells comprise a disruption in the RAMP1 gene and a genetic mosaic mouse wherein only a portion of the cells of the mouse comprise the gene disruption.” (See page 3, second paragraph, of the Office Action.) Furthermore, the Examiner states that “[t]he specification has not taught a phenotype for the genetic mosaic mice encompassed by the claims.” (*Id.*) As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants currently propose amending claim 1 herein to recite that the genome of the claimed mouse comprises a homozygous disruption of the RAMP1 gene. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment herein and reconsideration of the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004.

3. Claim 6 stands rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. According to the Examiner, [i]t is not clear if the claimed cell is further genetically-modified after isolation from the mouse [or] if the term [refers] to the original genetic modification of the RAMP1 gene in the mouse. (See page 4, second paragraph, of the Office Action.) As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants propose amending the claim herein to delete “genetically-modified.” Applicants also note that the term “cultured” is also proposed to be deleted given the previous amendment of May 24, 2004, which added that the claimed mouse cell is “isolated from the mouse of claim 1.” Applicants respectfully

Appl. No. 10/006,542  
Amendment dated October 28, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2004

request entry of the amendment herein and reconsideration of the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004.

4. Claim 7 stands rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Claim 7 is currently being cancelled herein.

5. Applicants believe that the amendments hereinabove place the Application in condition for immediate allowance. Therefore, entry of the amendments hereinabove, and reconsideration of the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004 are respectfully requested. Such prompt and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Date:

October 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Deborah A. Martin  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 44,222

Pfizer Inc.  
Patent Department, MS 8260-1611  
Eastern Point Road  
Groton, Connecticut 06340  
(860) 715-1821